



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,057	04/21/2004	Charles Norman Shaver	200314194-1	5954

22879 7590 04/05/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SPITTLE, MATTHEW D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/829,057

Applicant(s)

SHAVER ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew D. Spittle

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11 and 13-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNabb in view of Belkin Components, and further in view of Le et al.

Regarding claim 21, McNabb teaches a method for providing an internal Universal Serial Bus (USB) port within a computer chassis, said method comprising:

Providing a computer chassis having an external USB port (page 3, Figure 7) and an internally mounted first USB header (page 2, Figures 2, 3 and 3a show USB header connectors) for communicating with the external USB port (Figures 6 and 7 show that the external USB port(s) are connected to the USB header connectors);

Providing a printed wire board (PWB) supporting a USB hub (Figures 6 and 7 are interpreted as providing a USB hub, since they provide multiple USB connections; McNabb fails to expressly teach a printed wire board. Examiner takes official notice that it is old, and well known in the art to substitute a series of wires, printed circuit board, flexible film connector, or as in the case of McNabb, a flexible cable assembly for a printed wire board (USB Header; Figures 6 and 7). All are capable of performing the same function; i.e., carrying current across an electrically conductive medium.

Internally mounting the PWB within the computer chassis (See Figure 9) such that the PWB provides passthrough communication between the first USB header and the external USB port.

Wherein:

The computer chassis has mounts extending into the interior thereof (where mounts may be interpreted as screws; Figure 9);

The PWB has apertures formed therethrough (see the right side of the retaining brackets in Figure 6 or 7);

Internally mounting the PWB within the computer chassis comprising inserting the mounts into the apertures to secure the PWB to the computer chassis (Figure 9 shows inserting a screw through the bracket to secure it to the computer chassis).

McNabb fails to teach the USB port of the PWB operating as an internal USB port.

Belkin Components teach an internal USB port (page 5, labeled "PORT 5") for the purpose of providing connectivity for internal USB devices in a computer system such as an internal USB disk drive.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to incorporate an internal USB port as taught by Belkin Components into the USB header of McNabb for the purpose of providing connectivity for internal USB devices in a computer system such as an internal USB disk drive. This would have been obvious in order to provide greater flexibility in the types (both internal and external) of devices that could be connected to the computer system.

Regarding claim 23, McNabb teaches the additional limitation of interconnecting a first USB cable between the first USB header and the PWB (interpreted as a USB Header; Figures 6 and 7).

McNabb fails to teach a second USB cable between the PWB and the external USB port. Examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to interconnect a USB cable between the PWB (interpreted as a USB Header; Figures 6 and 7) and the external USB port for the purpose of extending its length. This would have been obvious in order to provide USB connectivity to some device that may be placed at a connection-prohibiting distance from the computer system to which the PWB is attached.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1, 2, 4 – 11, and 13 – 18 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Spittle whose telephone number is (571) 272-2467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2111

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



MDS



JOHN R. COTTINGHAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER